

## **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

### **Intellectually Gifted Eligibility Standards and Evaluation Criteria**

The revised eligibility standards for the identification of students as Intellectually Gifted were approved by the Board of Education on August 10, 2007. Statewide training of the revised assessment criteria was conducted on September 24, 2007. The following is a compilation of questions and answers pertaining to revisions in the gifted assessment and identification guidelines.

### **Classroom and Individual Screening**

- 1) **Question:** I don't seem to be able to get percentile rank scores for the April 2007 TCAP Achievement Assessment. Do you know how to get these?

**Answer:** The conversion of TCAP CRT scores to percentile scores changes each year. The conversion chart posted in 2004 for Intellectual Giftedness was only for that year (spring 2004 Achievement Tests). Effective in spring 2005, a notice was sent to all school system Testing Coordinators and Special Education Supervisors regarding the conversion of CRT scores to percentile scores. The principal at each school has a password to the TVAAS website where all students can be pulled up when looking for these conversion scores. They are available for all students taking the TCAP Achievement tests; therefore, you can access the lowest scores as well as the highest scores (that is--all students' percentile conversion scores). Last year (2006-2007) sets of scores for a school (or grade within the school) could be queried (e.g., request all percentile conversions below 15th percentile or at or above the 85th percentile); therefore, it is not necessary to look up each student individually. Additionally, there is a PowerPoint presentation on the Assessment, Evaluation and Research website under Tools and Resources that allows systems to identify those third graders. All other grades may obtain the percentiles by using the Student Pattern List report. More information about access to this site can be obtained through the Office of Assessment, Evaluation, and Research. Teresa McClure is the contact for specific information on how to access these scores: [Teresa.McClure@state.tn.us](mailto:Teresa.McClure@state.tn.us) or 615-253-4520.

- 2) **Question:** What has not changed with the Gifted Assessment Process? Can schools go ahead and conduct grade level screening?

**Answer:** Grade Level Screening procedures have not changed (i.e., forms and process). School systems can proceed with the Grade Level Screening procedures as described in the (2003) Gifted Manual currently on the web. Grade Level Screening requires the use of 2 State Forms: 1) Classroom Screening Summary, and 2) TCAP Classroom Summary. Grade level screening should not occur until after the end of the first grading period so that classroom teachers have an opportunity to become familiar with all students in his/her classroom.

- 3) **Question:** Can TCAP Language Composite scores be used in addition to the reading composite scores in grades K-2?

**Answer:** Yes – the kindergarten, first, and second grade TCAP assessments are the TerraNova which is a nationally-standardized group assessment. The TCAP Achievement Assessments for grades three through eight are based on Tennessee's

curriculum standards at each grade level and the score results are criterion-referenced. In grades 3 through 8 the Reading/Language Arts Achievement Tests are combined; therefore, they can count only once; however, you can use the Reading and Language Composite Scores as separate scores, as well as the Composite Score from the TerraNova. This provides more opportunities for very young children to meet the Educational Performance Criteria when the TerraNova is administered in these early grades.

- 4) Question:** Is the Referral for Individual Screening form that we have been using still to be used? Is it being updated to change the areas of screening from Academic Performance, Creative Thinking, and Academic Achievement to Educational Performance and Creativity/Characteristics of the Gifted?

**Answer:** All previously used forms (such as IG Child Find Brochure, Classroom Screening Summary, IG Tracking Log) that were used in the gifted assessment have been updated to correspond with the revised standards and are included in the Complete Intellectually Gifted Assessment Resource Packet. This resource packet will be posted on the Special Education Assessment web page.

- 5) Question:** Will we continue to use the Response to Individual Screening form? If so, is it also being updated to reflect the change in categories of assessment to Educational Performance Creativity/ Characteristics of the Gifted?

**Answer:** Yes and it will.

## **Assessment Guidelines, Documentation Requirements, and Eligibility**

- 6) Question:** Our LEA Plan for Gifted is complete and ready for submission with the exception of the TnCreat. Would you like us to hold our submission until this form is received or submit as is?

**Answer:** The State is moving the LEA Plan due date to the end of the school year, rather than early fall. We are making a few changes to the plan to adjust it to our revised eligibility criteria and to the State's goals for Intellectually Gifted included in the State Performance Plan (SPP) to OSEP. Hold on to your LEA Plan for now – especially anything you have electronically stored. Hopefully, writing this plan helped your school system understand the revised criteria.

- 7) Question:** I have two questions regarding the new gifted standards: 1) We were told at the State TAG conference this year that for certain students a 118 IQ was not required. I have many students with 5 to 6 TCAP scores above the 90th percentile who are scoring between an IQ of 114 to 116. I would like to know if any of these students could be considered for alternative assessments; as stated above, or if there was a clause for students to be accepted into the program based on a lower IQ score if the team was to make this decision. 2) What is a reasonable number of items checked on the Assessment Instrument form for a student to be considered for supplemental types of testing? I know that this is a team decision, but wondered what a reasonable number of checks would be.

**Answer:** The answer to your first question can be found in the Cognition section of this document. The guidelines for use of the standard error of the measurement (SEM) for First Range scores are outlined in detail.

The answer to your second question is a little more in-depth. The TnATISF (Tennessee Assessment Team Instrument Selection Form) is completed by the Assessment Team for every student who is assessed for gifted eligibility. The TnATISF serves as an assurance the most appropriate instruments for the valid and reliable assessments of students are being used. I cannot recommend a specific number for items that should be checked on this form. The Assessment Team should answer the following questions when determining appropriate test instruments for each student: Is one factor significant enough to affect the test results from a traditional instrument *or* do a combination of several factors indicate the need for selecting non-traditional instruments for evaluation of this student? Although the instrument selection does not require a specific number of items checked, the following guidelines may help. This form was developed to provide the Assessment Team with information that helps determine 1) the most appropriate assessment for each student, and 2) students for whom the TnSup (Tennessee Supplementary Gifted Performance Checklist) would be the most appropriate (and supplemental) assessment of Educational Performance. [Note: this is the category of assessment where TCAP achievement scores are also an option for assessment].

The first boxed section (Environmental Considerations for Assessment) of the TnATISF provides specific factors when considering use of the TnSup to measure Educational Performance. When the only item checked in this section is "Member of a group that is underrepresented in the gifted program," the TnSup is not appropriate and should not be used. In this case, other factors would need to be checked before the Assessment Team could clearly consider the TnSup as the most appropriate option for evaluation of achievement. On the other hand, if the only item checked in this section is "Limited opportunity to acquire depth in English (English not spoken in home, transience due to migrant employment of family, dialectical differences acting as a barrier to learning)," the Assessment Team may determine this one factor is a significant obstruction to the valid/reliable assessment of Educational Performance with traditional measures.

The second boxed section (Other Considerations for Assessment) provides the Team with additional factors that might be considered when 'selecting the most appropriate instrument' for the student. These instrument selections can vary from more to less verbally-loaded cognition tests to nonverbal cognition tests or additional achievement testing (beyond the TCAP).

The use of the TnATISF is based on the individual student's specific needs and is not considered 'supplemental testing'. The TnSup is the only supplementary form of assessment in the revised gifted criteria and need for assessment with the TnSup is determined by the Assessment Team and based on factors listed in the first section of the form, although factors included in the second section may also contribute to this determination.

- 8) Question:** When and how are we supposed to use the Tennessee Assessment Team Instrument Selection Form (TnATISF)? Can the Assessment Team determine which test of intelligence will be used or is that the responsibility of the School Psychologist? I've heard different things from different colleagues.

**Answer:** The TnATISF *may* be used by the Assessment Team prior to Individual

Screening and should be used if the Assessment Team has concerns regarding culturally-fair screening tools (example: administration of an individual achievement test when TCAP scores are questionable). Best Practice is to use the TnATISF prior to Individual Screening in all cases, however. Use of the TnATISF is a requirement for all students prior to Comprehensive Assessment. Even when risk factors are not present, specific instruments or checklists to be used for assessment of the student must be recorded in the Comprehensive Assessment Section of the TnATISF. This does not prevent the Assessment Team from providing additional tests if the student's test reveals a need for another more appropriate test. The TnATISF is a required document for gifted assessment. The school psychologist is usually the one person on the Assessment Team who has received the needed training to make a good judgment about which instrument should be used to measure cognition. If your school psychologist does not have the knowledge and professional expertise required to make these choices, perhaps another member of the team with years of experience can make a valid recommendation. The school psychologist should be aware that the Wechsler Scales of Intelligence or the Woodcock-Johnson Cognitive Assessment are not appropriate instrument choices for all students.

- 9) **Question:** Do we still need to have the regular teachers fill out the General Education Documentation of Classroom Interventions and have another teacher observation other than the regular teacher? I'm not sure if all the other school systems are using the same paperwork.

**Answer:** Yes, you do. The General Education Documentation of Classroom Interventions (forms A & B) are included in the Complete Intellectually Gifted Assessment Resource Packet. School systems may select which of these two forms most accurately documents classroom interventions which have been implemented for students identified as gifted. This form addresses the Intellectually Gifted Eligibility Standards 2.c. (2) (d) requirement of "documentation, including observation and/or assessment, of how Intellectual Giftedness adversely impacts the child's educational performance in his/her learning environment."

- 10) **Question:** I noticed the verbiage for "adverse affect" has been expanded to the definition which states "*Intellectually Gifted* means a child whose intellectual abilities and potential for achievement are so outstanding the child's educational performance is adversely affected. *Adverse affect* means the general curriculum alone is inadequate to appropriately meet the student's educational needs." I do not see how this definition is different from the requirement that a "student's needs cannot be met in the regular program without special education," as a condition to be eligible for special education services. Would you explain the difference in these two statements? To me it seems that a student could not be identified as Intellectually Gifted unless that student is eligible for special education services. Would that not mean that students could not be identified as Intellectually Gifted for general education gifted programs?

**Answer:** The phrase "general curriculum alone" means without the provision of services in the "regular program" that meet the needs of the student who has been identified as Intellectually Gifted. All school systems have a general education program; however, some school systems have accelerated general education curriculum that is provided through specialized programs, such as a general education enrichment or gifted program. Typically, these programs are designed to provide instruction that is appropriate for students who are high-achievers, talented or gifted. Therefore, IEP Team members should be aware of the difference between

the “regular program” and “general curriculum” when students are identified as Intellectually Gifted and determined to be eligible for special education services.

**11) Question:** Can a child go into kindergarten before the he or she has turned five by being identified as gifted?

**Answer:** TCA 49-6-3001 states that a child must become five years of age on or before September 30<sup>th</sup> of that school year before he or she can enter school. The only way a student may gain early entry into kindergarten is through eligibility as Intellectually Gifted. Eligibility in special education is a two-prong process. The first part of that process is a result of the assessment process, whereby the student does meet specific eligibility standards set forth for identification as Intellectually Gifted. After evaluation, the assessment team meets to determine 1) if the student meets the Intellectually Gifted criteria, and 2) if the student exhibits need for services due to his or her Intellectual Giftedness and is eligible for special education services. If there is a need for services, an IEP Team will write an IEP (Individual Education Program) for that student which addresses the child’s specific needs. One avenue for meeting these needs is early entry to kindergarten and this may be the only accommodation needed to serve the child’s needs. The most important consideration to make when considering early entry to kindergarten is the child’s level of socio-emotional maturity – that is – his or her ability to interact with kindergarten age students appropriately and to function in the typical structured environment of a kindergarten class.

When a child who is not yet five years old has been identified and determined to be eligible for services as Intellectually Gifted, the next step is to request an IEP Team meeting and discuss the child’s needs – early placement in kindergarten is a possible option. An instrument called the Iowa Acceleration Scale is very useful when trying to make a decision about grade skipping, including early entry. In addition, a study called the Templeton Report [50 years of looking at accelerated students (also known as “A Nation Deceived”)] is available free. It can be downloaded at [www.nationdeceived.org](http://www.nationdeceived.org). This report gives a great deal of information about many different kinds of acceleration, including whole grade acceleration, and the statistical outcomes of this kind of intervention for gifted students.

## Reevaluation

**12) Question:** With the new Intellectually Gifted eligibility standards now in place, our district is questioning whether this will in any way impact the reevaluation process for Intellectually Gifted students? Specifically, will students who are determined eligible prior to 7<sup>th</sup> grade be required to have any testing or assessment completed for reevaluation? Example: A student determined eligible in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade and is due for reevaluation in 6<sup>th</sup> grade. Will Intellectually Gifted students in grades 7 – 12 continue to be exempt from reevaluation unless requested by a member of the IEP team?

**Answer:** Students identified as Intellectually Gifted are not required to be reevaluated in grades 7-12; however, the IEP Team must determine eligibility through the team process of writing a new Eligibility Report every three years and no later than the ‘Reevaluation Due Date’ or the student will be dropped from the Special Education Census. Reevaluation prior to 7<sup>th</sup> grade always begins with the

reevaluation review process. All documents for this review are located for download at <http://state.tn.us/education/speced/seassessment.shtml>. Section V of the Reevaluation Summary Report is completed by the IEP Team at which time any additional tests (or a comprehensive reevaluation) are determined to be needed. The student's identification as Intellectually Gifted does not necessarily change when a few tests, observations, etc. are conducted as a result of recommendations of the IEP Team. Eligibility is reconsidered using revised standards when the IEP Team determines through the Reevaluation Review process a student needs a Comprehensive Evaluation in order to determine if the student is eligible. The instructions for the reevaluation review process and the required documents to conduct this review are located on the special education assessment page of the web.

**13) Question:** In the past, students in our school district who qualified as Intellectually Gifted were served in the general education curriculum. We have since shifted our philosophy so that students must be in special education in order to receive gifted services. The problem is that we have several students who initially met TN state criteria but were determined ineligible because their needs could be met in the general education curriculum. Now, we want to make them all eligible; however, some of them are beyond the 3-year reevaluation date. Best practice would be to reassess those students; however, the change in the law indicates that we no longer have to conduct reevaluations when students reach the 7<sup>th</sup> grade. So, would it be possible to "activate" or make the students eligible who are beyond the 3-year reevaluation date considering the change in regulations? We have several parents who do not want their children reevaluated but would like for them to receive special education support services, especially as they transition to high school. Please advise.

**Answer:** Typically, any student who has exceeded the 3 years since initial evaluation receiving special education services needs to receive a Comprehensive Evaluation (following guidelines for an initial evaluation). In this situation you should conduct a Reevaluation Summary Review of each student who has not been receiving gifted services through special education, whether the student is in grades 7-12 or pre-7<sup>th</sup> grade. Any time a program change is proposed, such as from general education to special education, the IEP Team should conduct a Reevaluation Summary Review. Those students who are more than 3 years out from initial evaluation AND who met the standards to be identified as Intellectually Gifted, but were determined by the IEP Team as not eligible due to not "needing special ed services" can be reviewed by the Assessment Team following the guidelines on the web for a Reevaluation Summary Review. The instructions and forms are located at [www.state.tn.us/education/speced/seassessment/.shtml#INITIAL](http://www.state.tn.us/education/speced/seassessment/.shtml#INITIAL). If the IEP Team feels the information gathered from initial assessment, statewide assessment, cumulative school records, and grades are indicative the student is 'still a student who is identifiable as Intellectually Gifted', go ahead and write the student's Eligibility Report and IEP. You should follow this procedure even when the student is in the 7<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grades. The student needs to be determined as eligible first. If through the Reevaluation Review, questions arise as to whether the student is eligible, you can conduct a partial or comprehensive evaluation based on the team's decision in Section V of the Reevaluation Summary Review Report.

**14) Question:** We were wondering about students who are evaluated in K through 3 before the age of 9. If they are productive and still demonstrate gifted characteristics, can we reevaluate without retesting them? Our practice has been to retest, if they were evaluated prior to age 9.

**Answer:** You should always conduct a reevaluation by following the guidelines for a Reevaluation Summary Review as described in this section. Section V of this review directs the IEP Team and parent through a series of questions that help determine whether sufficient information to determine if the student continues to be a student who is eligible as Intellectually Gifted. There are valid reasons for conducting a 2<sup>nd</sup> Comprehensive Evaluation for students who were initially identified before the age of 8. However, whatever reasons there may be to test or not to test must be determined by the IEP Team through this process. After the team completes Section V, you will write a new Eligibility Report.

**15) Question:** For re-evaluations, do we need to complete the new Gifted Assessment Scoring Grid and show they meet the new guidelines or do we just use the same forms for re-evaluations we used previously?

**Answer:** The Intellectually Gifted Scoring Grid is used to help determine initial eligibility only. The scoring grid is not a guideline for the determination of continued eligibility (reevaluation). Guidelines for the determination of continued eligibility are provided through the Reevaluation Summary Review (see previous question and answer).

**16) Question:** We have a student who was placed into the Gifted Program this school year but before we had access to the new procedures. He does not meet the 118 IQ that is in the new standards. How do we handle this situation? If his folder is reviewed for monitoring in the future, will we be marked down due to not following eligibility procedures? Also, are the gifted reevaluations subject to the 118 IQ score?

**Answer:** Gifted Reevaluations should be addressed like all other reevaluations – through use of the Reevaluation Summary Review process. The student is not required to meet the initial criteria for the disability in order to continue to have the disability. The only time the student would be required to meet ALL criteria for that disability is if the IEP Team determines through the reevaluation review process described in Section V of the State Reevaluation Summary Report there is a need for a Comprehensive Evaluation. In this case a Comprehensive Evaluation, including all procedural safeguards (i.e., Notice and Consent for Initial Assessment, Prior Written Notice, and Rights of Children with Disabilities and Parent Responsibilities) is initiated. When a student receives a Comprehensive Evaluation, the current disability eligibility standards must be used to determine if the student is eligible for special education services.

## **Educational Performance: Assessment Options 1 – 6**

**17) Question:** What areas of achievement can be used for Assessment Option 1?

**Answer:** These are listed on the K – 12 Intellectually Gifted Scoring and Documentation Grid on page 2. They are:

- Reading or Reading/Language Arts
- Language

- Written Language (standardized, individual test only)
- Academic Knowledge (WJIII)
- Mathematics
- Social Studies
- Science
- Total Achievement Battery Score

Further clarifications of achievement scores are made on this page and include:

- Area, Cluster, Composite, or Brief (WJIII) scores from more than one instrument or type of instrument (Group or Individual) may be used, but only one score from any academic area (e.g., TCAP Reading/Language Arts OR WJIII Brief Reading) may be used for scoring.
- The TCAP Writing Assessment may not be used.
- Districts must provide previously grade-skipped students with a nationally normed test if they are disqualified by a criterion-referenced test.
- The use of percentile conversion scores from CRTs other than the TCAP must be approved by the State Department of Education.

**18) Question:** Can Written Language Composite and Academic Knowledge scores be used from Individual Achievement tests?

**Answer:** Yes, Written Language Composite and Academic Knowledge scores from individual, standardized achievement tests are acceptable as scores for academic achievement (Assessment Option 1). However, the Academic Knowledge subtests measuring Social Studies and Science may not be broken out and reported separately for those two areas of achievement.

**19) Question:** Does the test for achievement for gifted have to be individualized or can it be a group test like the TCAP?

**Answer:** You can use the TCAP percentile conversion scores for gifted achievement. The TCAP percentile conversion scores are one of the areas reviewed when districts conduct 'Grade Level Screening' which is required for gifted screening before grade 4. Please be aware the TCAP cut-off scores used in grade level screening may be lower than the TCAP score requirements to be eligible in Assessment Option 1. Some students have difficulty attending or have not developed good test-taking skills and do not perform as well on group assessments, even though they have attained a high level of academic achievement. This is one of the reasons the TnATISF is required prior to every Comprehensive Evaluation for Intellectually Gifted. In this case an individual test of achievement may be the most reliable measure of the student's attained academic achievement.

**20) Question:** Is written language intended to be one of the content areas for educational performance?

**Answer:** You can use an individual writing achievement assessment but not the TCAP Writing Assessment.

**21) Question:** Regarding the WJIII Achievement Test – can the Broad tests be used for Option 1 assessment? The Broad Reading, Math, and Written Language scores are all made up of three subtests. In the case of Broad Reading, it is made up of Letter-Word Recognition, Reading Fluency, and Passage Comprehension.

**Answer:** Broad Reading, Broad Math, and Broad Written Language are acceptable score clusters.

- 22) Question:** Can the WJIII Achievement Brief Reading, Brief Math and Brief Writing scores from the WJIII be used for achievement? The Brief Reading is made up of two scores: Letter-Word Recognition and Passage Comprehension. Thus, it is a composite score without the fluency component. The other Broad vs. Brief scores are the same, with fluency being part of the Broad score and being omitted from the Brief score; therefore, Brief Math and Brief Writing are also composite scores of the Broad score equivalents without the fluency subtest included in scoring.

**Answer:** Yes – Brief Reading, Brief Math and Brief Writing are acceptable scores for determining academic achievement in the gifted assessment. Meyer and Felton defined *fluency* as "the ability to read connected text rapidly, smoothly, effortlessly, and automatically with little conscious attention to the mechanics of reading, such as decoding" (1999, p. 284). The criterion for Assessment Option 1 requires assessment of the student's level of achievement in these areas. The student's fluency may elevate or lower the results from his/her achievement assessment. When the "fluency" subtests included in scoring the WJIII "Broad" cluster scores result in a lower percentile score; for eligibility purposes – it is appropriate to use the "Brief" scores.

- 23) Question:** Since Assessment Option 1 specifically mentions *subtest scores*, what individual subtests can we use?

**Answer:** This verbiage was based on which test is being considered under Assessment Option 1. Some tests refer to area scores as subtests--although the term is used interchangeably. Since this question has been asked, the description in Column 3 (Scoring) for Assessment Option 1 has been changed to *Area or Cluster Scores*.

- 24) Question:** When looking at the TCAP scores to determine a first range for educational performance does the IEP Team consider only the scores for the past year? I have a 9<sup>th</sup> grade student whose scores dropped in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade but were above the 95<sup>th</sup>tile the three previous years in one subject area. If we use the scores from last year she will not make a first range in educational performance.

**Answer:** For *initial evaluation* you must look at the most recent year for the TCAP Achievement Assessments; however, if the student has consistently scored high on his/her TCAP Achievement Assessments in previous years, it would be appropriate to administer an individual achievement test. This is one reason the Tennessee Assessment Team Instrument Selection Form (TnATISF) is required for all students who have been referred for a Comprehensive Evaluation. When the IEP/Assessment Team meets to complete the TnATISF for this student – prior to the evaluation – the team should record the individual achievement test instrument (i.e., WJIII, WIAT-II, etc.) determined to be most appropriate for that student on the TnATISF. The following is noted for Assessment Option 1 on the K – 12 Intellectually Gifted Assessment Documentation page: Area, Cluster, Composite, or Brief (WJIII) scores from more than one instrument or type of instrument (Group or Individual) may be used, but only one score from any academic area (e.g., TCAP Reading/Language Arts OR WJIII Brief Reading) may be used for scoring. There are many varying reasons students' TCAP scores may show a decline from a pattern of high achievement evidenced by scores in previous years. The high achievement

scores on TCAP Assessments from previous years, when combined with classroom performance is an indication the student's actual level of achievement would be more appropriately assessed through use of an individual test of achievement. Most students perform better on individually administered tests.

**25) Question:** Can TCAP Language Composite scores be used in grades K – 12 in addition to the reading composite scores?

**Answer:** Yes--The K, 1, and 2 TCAP Assessment is the TerraNova. The TerraNova is a nationally standardized group achievement assessment. The TCAP Achievement Assessments for grade 3 – 8 are Criterion-Referenced and Reading/Language Arts have been combined; therefore, they can count Reading/Language only once. The Reading and Language Composite Scores, as well as the Composite Score, are permissible scores for the TerraNova. This provides more opportunities for very young children to meet the Educational Performance Criteria and is also an incentive for systems that do administer the TerraNova in those grades. In summary, the following scores may be used from TCAP Assessments: TerraNova – K, 1<sup>st</sup>, and 2<sup>nd</sup> grades – 6 academic areas (Reading Composite, Language Composite, Math Composite, Science, Social Studies, Total Achievement) and TCAP Achievement – 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> grades – 4 academic areas (Reading/ Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies).

**26) Question:** When using GPA, what time period do we look at (year, semester, and 9-weeks)? The "current GPA" is the cumulative GPA for all the courses that a student has taken that count toward their GPA. A 9<sup>th</sup> grader might have a GPA based on 3 or 4 courses taken for credit in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade, while a senior might have 22 credits. This is what I thought was intended for GPA; however, some of my colleagues feel GPA is determined by the grades a student has made in a semester or in a year. There is a complicating factor in that some middle schools keep a GPA for the middle school grades that does not carry into the cumulative high school GPA.

**Answer:** Assessment Option 4 – Current GPA – is the cumulative grade point average (i.e., 4 course credits for the freshman and 22 course credits for the senior). Since the Middle School GPA does not carry over into calculation of high school GPA calculations, the GPA for 9<sup>th</sup> grade students can be within one year of the student's grade level and may include the student's GPA for the 8<sup>th</sup> grade.

**27) Question:** Regarding the required "Awards" time line, is it awards the student has earned in the last 2 or 3 years? The Scoring Grid has two years on it, but previously it was three years. If we look at a three year reevaluation cycle, why wouldn't we consider awards from the previous 3 years?

**Answer:** For initial eligibility, "Awards" earned within three years of the assessment can be used. This has been updated on the K-12 Intellectually Gifted Scoring Grid.

**28) Question:** Will the Awards Documentation form with all the categories be included in the updated forms?

**Answer:** No – Record all first, second and third place awards at the district, in-state or regional, statewide and national levels on the Tennessee K-12 Intellectually Gifted Assessment Documentation page (page 2 of the scoring grid).

## Creativity/Characteristics of Gifted Assessment Options 7 – 13

**29) Question:** If the TnCreat and TnTOC are both completed, are both counted on the Assessment Scoring Grid? Example: If a student receives a score of 50 points on the TnCreat and receives a score of 22/27 on the TnTOC, would that yield 60 total category points for the Creativity/ Characteristics component? Or, do you just count one of those scores, thus yielding 30 total category points?

**Answer:** You may count only one of the 'Assessment Options' scores in the column 'Category Points'. You should count the one instrument on which the student scored in the highest range. In your example (both being 3rd Range scores) either score could be used, but not both.

**30) Question:** Is there a scoring guide for the TN Teacher Observation Checklist (TnTOC) and the TnTOC+ other than the 2 scoring criteria sheets that we received? Do we just add the total of the checked items on the TnTOC that are listed on the scoring criteria sheet?

**Answer:** The TnTOC/TnTOC+ Scoring Criteria are self-explanatory--page 1 is straight forward for scoring the TnTOC. Page 2 walks through the scoring of the Tennessee Parent Information Form (TnPIF). This score is added to the TnTOC score (calculated on page 1) to obtain the TnTOC+ score. Scoring guidelines for the TnTOC+ are also on page 2.

**31) Question:** Would you consider changing the name of the Tennessee Creative Thinking Checklist? It is not a checklist. It is a rating scale.

**Answer:** You are correct. The document has been renamed and is included in the Complete IG Assessment Resource Packet. This can be found and downloaded from the assessment page of the web.

**32) Question:** Under the Creativity/Characteristics of Gifted do we just administer one of the assessments or do we administer multiple assessments but just use one for scoring purposes?

**Answer:** You are required to administer one assessment for each of the Assessment Categories (Educational Performance, Creativity/Characteristics of Gifted, and Cognition) and record the assessment with the highest number of points for that category in the last column of the scoring grid for each of the assessment categories. You are not required to 'go on a fishing expedition' until the student scores points for each category. Please keep in mind; however, the determination of which assessment instruments will be used is made by the assessment team with the Tennessee Assessment Team Instrument Selection Form (TnATISF) as documentation prior to the Comprehensive Assessment. The decision to continue assessment in any category should be revisited by the team after initial assessment is completed. Additional assessment in any category should be based on the results obtained through assessment or information that may have surfaced during the evaluation. Examples of reasons to continue with assessment in the Creativity/ Characteristics Category might be:

- 1) the student has met the criteria in the Educational Performance and Cognition categories with 40 points (out of 50 required to meet criteria) and the instrument used in this category is determined by the team not to be an accurate measure of the student's creativity; or
- 2) there is need for an assessment instrument that is more sensitive to the

student's socio-cultural needs.

**33) Question:** Can the Creativity Subscale of the Gifted Evaluation Scale-2 be used for the target instrument on creativity?

**Answer:** No, it cannot – evaluation of the Creativity/Characteristics of Gifted Target Instrument can be made with the Torrance (TTCT) Figural or Verbal, the Williams CAP, or the Profile of Creative Abilities (PCA).

**34) Question:** Can the GES-2 be used on any part of the scoring grid?

**Answer:** The GES-2 is included in Assessment Option 10.

**35) Question:** How do we score the GES-II and the GRS for Assessment Option 10?

**Answer:** The scoring for the GES-II and the GRS are included on the updated scoring grid and are as follows:

GES-2

- Range 1: A total quotient of 115 - 122
- Range 2: A total quotient of 123 - 129
- Range 3: A total quotient of 130 and above

GRS

- Range 1: 3 sub-test T-Scores  $\geq 60$ , with 2 subtests from Intellectual Ability (IA), Academic Ability (AA), or Creativity (C)
- Range 2: 3 sub-test T-Scores  $\geq 65$ , with 2 subtests from Intellectual Ability (IA), Academic Ability (AA), or Creativity (C)
- Range 3: 3 sub-test T-Scores  $\geq 70$ , with 2 subtests from Intellectual Ability (IA), Academic Ability (AA), or Creativity (C)

**36) Question:** In the past, we have always sent the Parent Observation Checklist home. Is this no longer needed if you choose to use another measurement like the TN Creative Thinking Checklist?

**Answer:** The Parent is the first person listed under the Evaluation Participants for all disability standards. Therefore, you must always obtain information (usually in the form of a questionnaire) from the parent. The TnPIF has been developed and aligned to Mary Frazier's TABS, the Torrance and other leading researched characteristics. The TnPIF is a document that provides needed information and history of the child and can be part of the student's assessment when scored in conjunction with the TnTOC. This score is the TnTOC+. You must gather information from the parent and you are required to use the TnPIF to do that whether the TnPIF is combined with the TnTOC for scoring or not.

**37) Question:** Can a checklist keep a child from being eligible or do we have to continue on with the Torrance, etc? This question has been asked about the two checklists – TnTOC/TnTOC+ and the TnCcreat. We have the same problem as before, in that these are not standardized assessments. If we do not continue to the Torrance, Williams CAP or the PCA (Assessment Option 7)—we have allowed in a few instances a non-standardized checklist to keep a student from meeting eligibility criteria. We have the ability in our system to address this issue through our Assessment Team process and through administration of the Torrance. It seems that other counties may not have either of these things in place. In our school district we would like to make it a team decision to pursue the standardized test of creativity or not on an individual student basis. How does the State view this?

**Answer:** The guidelines from a 2005 memorandum described the process to be followed in this case. Although part scores are no longer used, the intent of this memorandum remains unchanged. If the TnCreat or the TnTOC/TnTOC+ (both State checklist/rating scales) are the only score results preventing a student from meeting the eligibility requirements, the student should be administered a standardized assessment of creativity. This includes the test instruments listed for Assessment Option 7 (TTCT, Williams CAP, and PCA) and Assessment Option 10 (GES-2 and GRS). Since this memorandum was written in 2005, most school systems have acquired either the Gifted Evaluation Scales-2 or the Gifted Rating Scales. An additional plus for the use of the GRS is the availability of two different grade-level assessments: 1) GRS – School, and 2) GRS – Primary. This allows an option for assessment of pre-school and school-age children.

**38) Question:** In the past we used the Williams Test of Divergent Thinking for creativity. The new gifted documentation form lists percentiles for the Williams Scale and I don't think we can obtain those from the Williams. We previously used "percentage" as a criterion. Do we use the Williams Test of Divergent Thinking only as we did in the past or all 3 parts? Can you help me with this?

**Answer:** The Williams Scale is a part of the Williams Creativity Assessment Packet (CAP). The Williams CAP has a Pupil Assessment Matrix which assigns standard deviations to the Williams. The total possible points are 100 and the mean (50th percentile) is 50 correct answers. The revised K-12 Intellectually Gifted Scoring Grid includes scoring for the Williams CAP (Creative Assessment Packet). The scoring grid has been updated and includes scoring for the Williams Creativity Assessment Packet (CAP). The scoring for the Williams CAP is:

First Range: 1 SD = 60; Second Range: 1 ½ SDs = 70; Third Range: 2 SDs = 80

**39) Question:** There is a rumor circulating that the Torrance can only be administered after specific training. Upon reading the manuals, I didn't see anything indicating this; in fact, the manual sites studies where teachers and a secretary scored the Torrance with as much reliability as their trained staff. I am referring to pp. 2 and 7 of the Directions Manual for the Figural Forms; pp. 3 and 11 of the Directions Manual for the Verbal Forms; p. 2 of the Scoring Manual for the Verbal Forms; and p. 3 of the Streamlined Scoring Guide for Figural Forms. It appears that teachers and secretaries can score the test if they have "thoroughly and carefully studied and accepted" the scoring guide. The publishers also indicate that classroom "teachers and others can do the scoring reliably by following instructions carefully or by training through a course or workshop." The company refers to tests they conducted comparing scoring by the teachers and secretaries to that of their trained scorers. They also imply that teachers can administer it. I saw no mention of a required certification in these manuals. Can you clarify?

**Answer:** First of all, let me preface my answer – Tennessee's revised gifted criteria gives significant weight to a standardized test of creativity (Assessment Option 7 – which is a Target Instrument). The Torrance is an excellent measure of creativity when the scoring results are reliable and valid. You are correct – the manual does not reference any requirement for people to be certified in order to assess or score the Torrance. However, Tennessee's revised criteria for gifted does require that tests used are both valid and reliable. The only way the State can ensure reliable and valid scoring of the Torrance is by requiring trained scorers. Individuals who are trained by the Torrance Center must reach at least 90% inter-rater reliability in order

to be certified. Individuals who do not go through training are not likely to achieve such reliable results on their own. Even when individuals are trained, very few reach the required reliability for certification on the first try. As any school psychologist knows, such a test is only as reliable as its scoring. If your school system knowingly allows untrained or poorly trained individuals to score the Torrance, it will open itself to action by knowledgeable individuals who can refute the reliability of the test. I hope that all school systems would want to take all due precaution in ensuring that the tests that are given are administered and scored in the most valid and reliable manner possible. School systems that knowingly eschew the relatively inexpensive training of TTCT scorers, yet use the tests and scores, are behaving in a negligent manner.

The State, in collaboration with the TAG and TIGER organizations, is currently in the planning stages to provide the training for Torrance certification. The training and certification can be obtained by most school professionals, such as teachers of gifted or school psychologists. Please note two other instruments are available and do not require specialized training to assess creativity for Assessment Option 7: 1) the Williams Creativity Assessment Packet (CAP) and 2) the Profile of Creative Abilities (PCA). Both are available from Pro-Ed.

**40) Question:** We have the Torrance, but only one person in our district is qualified to score, do we need to go get the training or is it all right to use the Williams?

**Answer:** The administration and scoring of the Torrance (TTCT Figural and Verbal) tests does require training and certification. The Williams CAP and the Profile of Creative Abilities (PCA) may also be administered to students for Assessment Option 7. Neither of these assessments require specialized training and certification.

It would definitely be advantageous for your school district to obtain the training and certification required to administer and score the Torrance. The TTCT is especially useful for identifying students from underrepresented populations whose 'giftedness' is primarily evident through the Creativity/Characteristics Assessment Category Target Instrument. The Torrance (Figural) is the least subjective instrument in this category and the instrument most likely to identify giftedness in many of our underrepresented student populations. The Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (TTCT – Figural and Verbal) are published and may be purchased through Scholastic Testing Services. If anyone in your district does wish to get this training at this time, the contact information is listed below:

Torrance Center for Creativity and Talent Development  
323 Aderhold Hall, University of Georgia  
Athens, GA 30602-7143  
Phone: (706) 542-5104  
Fax: (706) 542-5649  
Email: [creative@uga.edu](mailto:creative@uga.edu)

**41) Question:** There is a new test listed on the scoring grid – the Profile of Creative Abilities (the PCA) – for Assessment Option 7. Does this test require special training and certification like the Torrance? What is the PCA, where can it be purchased, and how is it scored? Also, where can we find the Williams CAP?

**Answer:** Both the Profile of Creative Abilities (PCA) and the Williams Creativity Assessment Packet (CAP) are published and may be purchased through Pro-Ed. The PCA shows good promise for identification of students in Assessment Option 7.

The PCA is standardized and has normative data for students between the ages 5 through 14. It is an effective tool for assessing students who are gifted with exceptional creative ability. The PCA's two subtests – Drawing and Categories – do not require special training and certification, and are combined to form a Creativity Index (CI). The PCA also includes Home Rating Scales (HRS) and School Rating Scales (SRS). The scoring criteria for Ranges 1, 2, and 3 are included on the updated Tennessee K-12 Intellectually Gifted Scoring and Documentation Grid and are as follows:

- First Range: Creativity Index  $\geq 115$ – $\leq 122$  and  
Home Rating Scale or School Rating Scale  $\geq 115$ – $\leq 122$
- Second Range: Creativity Index  $\geq 123$ – $\leq 129$  and  
Home Rating Scale or School Rating Scale  $\geq 115$ – $\leq 122$
- Third Range: Creativity Index  $\geq 130$  and  
Home Rating Scale or School Rating Scale  $\geq 130$

**42) Question:** Our system does not have a standardized creativity test such as the Torrance and there would be considerable time and expense involved in providing such for our system. You mentioned that the Creative Thinking Checklist was closely aligned with the Torrance. Are you (the Task Force) considering allowing the use of the Creative Thinking Checklist as a Target instrument?

**Question:** The TnCreat will not be a Target Instrument--Target Instruments must be valid and reliable to the constructs measured and--standardized--which the TnCreat is not. However, the Williams CAP has been updated on the Scoring Grid and the Profile of Creative Abilities (PCA) has been added as Assessment Option 7 or Target Instruments. Neither the Williams CAP nor the PCA require certification training in order to administer and/or score these assessments as does the Torrance.

## Cognition: Assessment Option 14

**43) Question:** During training, it was mentioned that the use of the standard error of measurement for certain students would be acceptable under circumstances to obtain a First Range score of 10 points in the Cognition Component – that is a score of  $118 \pm \text{SEM}$  or a score of 115. Also, does the psychologist have to designate this (use of standard error of measurement) in the written report that we receive in order for us to use a 115?

**Answer:** The basic guidelines for use of the standard error of measurement for scoring at First Range (10 points) include:

- The student has met the criteria in the Educational Performance Component and can receive at least a First Range score (10 points) in Assessment Options 1, 2, or 3;
- The student has met the criteria to score in 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> Range for a Target Instrument in either the Educational Performance or Creativity/Characteristics of Gifted Components;
- The total of the student's scorable points from the Educational Performance and Creativity/Characteristics Components is at least 40. Fifty (50) points are required to meet criteria to be identified as Intellectually Gifted; and
- The student's Cognitive Score is not 118 but is within one SEM (usually  $\pm 3$ ) to fulfill the requirement of a First Range Target Score for Cognition and/or an

additional 10 points for the required Total Points of 50.

Therefore, if a student's IQ score was 115 or higher, and all the above requirements have been met—he or she meets the current criteria. Please be mindful, however, the use of SEM for Cognition at first range applies only for assessment scoring outcomes that meet these requirements.

**44) Question:** There is a gifted referral who had a 126 on the Verbal and 86 on the Perceptual. The perceptual is low due to double vision. Under these circumstances, can we use the 126? even though the guidelines say there has to be 130 with a split, there is a physical reason for the low score. It brings her full scale down to 112. I forgot to say that the student earned 30 points on the achievement area and 20 points on the creativity

**Answer:** There are always exceptions to the rule—when those exceptions can be documented and justified. This is such a case. S/he can (and should) be considered as eligible under these criteria as Intellectually Gifted. Her double vision alone is good documentation for establishing the 'need for special education services' -- that she is eligible. The student has met the criteria for Gifted with 50 points and would have met the first range Cognition criteria if s/he did not have a significant perceptual problem (double vision). Since this test has already been administered to this student, be sure to document this 'exception' in his or her written report. This is an excellent example of a situation where the TnATISF can help the Assessment Team determine the most appropriate assessment for the student. If the Assessment Team is aware of a student's exceptionalities—in this case, a significant visual perceptual deficit—that prevents valid and reliable measurement of the student's cognition—in this case, measurement of the student's perceptual abilities—the Assessment Team can document that the verbal portions of the intelligence test are the most appropriate measures of intelligence.

**45) Question:** When determining giftedness, is there any allowance for substituting the General Ability Index (GAI) from the WISC-IV for the FSIQ? Is the GAI appropriate to use for all students or is it to be used based on the items checked on the new Tennessee Assessment Selection Instrument Form? (TnATISF, I believe). May the GAI be used under any circumstance when doing a gifted evaluation? Is the psychologist the one to determine use of the GAI? Can a parent request it?

**Answer:** The publishers discuss the possible use of the GAI when either the Working Memory Index or Processing Speed Index or both are significantly different from Verbal Comprehension or Perceptual Reasoning. They also state that gifted children often seem to have such a pattern where the WMI or PSI or both are significantly lower than the VCI and PRI. The psychologist will not be able to determine until the student has been evaluated if there is a valid reason to use the GAI, rather than the FSIQ. When interpreting the results of the WISC-IV, the psychologist should use professional judgment to determine if the Working Memory Index, Processing Speed Index, or both have significantly lowered the student's Full-Scale IQ score. Parents always have the right to provide input for the evaluation of their child and their requests should be considered. The GAI can certainly be used as the score which determines cognitive functioning – after the Full-Scale score and all Index scores have been calculated. For some students the Full-Scale IQ score is elevated by including the Working Memory Index and the Processing Speed Index. For other students these subtests lower this score.

**46) Question:** Can the Dumont-Willis 1 score be used as the cognitive measure when evaluating for intellectual giftedness?

**Answer:** The answer to your question is yes--under certain circumstances. The Psych Corp GAI tables, Dumont and Willis Index, or the GAI tables provided by Kaufman & Flanagan can be used. They are similar measures of intelligence when there is significant difference that would affect the full-scale score for the student. If a student has weaknesses in basic sensory, motor, or psychological processes (i.e., visual impairment, hearing loss, cerebral palsy, oral language disorder, word-finding impairment, auditory perception, visual perception, processing speed, working memory, etc.), it is not only reasonable, but a requirement under the federal regulations, to seek a measure of intelligence that is not contaminated by weaknesses that have been documented by testing (other than the cognitive ability test itself), observation, classroom performance, etc. IDEA Regulations regarding evaluation of children state: "Tests are selected and administered so as best to ensure that if a test is administered to a child with impaired sensory, manual, or speaking skills, **the test results accurately reflect the child's aptitude or achievement level** or whatever other factors the test purports to measure, rather than reflecting the child's impaired sensory, manual, or speaking skills..." [§300.541 (c) (2) (e)]. More information and research regarding the DW1 can be found at [http://alpha.fdu.edu/psychology/WISCIV\\_DWI.htm](http://alpha.fdu.edu/psychology/WISCIV_DWI.htm). In the research article entitled "Using the DWI or GAI" by Dumont Willis, the following statements help summarize appropriate use of the DW1:

- Examiners may wish to report DW1s when the Verbal (VCI) and Perceptual (PRI) abilities are found to be close to one another yet significantly different from those of the Working Memory (WMI) or Processing Speed (PSI) abilities...
- Estimates of overall abilities calculated in this way should always be clearly identified as DW1 scores in both text and tables of reports.
- These scores must not be confused with the Full Scale IQ, although they may be more useful estimates of intellectual ability in some cases, for example, for some gifted children and for some children with relative weaknesses in working memory and/or processing speed.

**47) Question:** How do you use the 'split discrepancy' criteria for Cognition? Have the guidelines changed for using the 'split discrepancy' criteria? Do you have to indicate you are going to use 'split discrepancy' on the TnATISF?

**Answer:** Split Discrepancy criteria may be used in the Cognition Component of the Intellectually Gifted assessment when:

- one of the major component area scores, which is comprised of three (3) or more subtests, is a score equal to or greater than 130; and
- this score is 1.5 standard deviations (23 points) higher than another major component area.

You may use split discrepancy scores only if split score is  $\pm 130$  in one score cluster of three or more subtests with a  $1\frac{1}{2}$  standard deviation discrepancy from another score cluster. Note: the lower component score may be comprised of two (2) or more subtests.

**48) Question:** Can the extended battery be used for the cognitive split? I am referring to the WJIII and the K-ABC.

**Answer:** The extended battery can be used for the cognitive split. Be sure to follow

the guidelines for the cognitive split in the previous question.

**49) Question:** If a 118 IQ is a required component, must the process of testing be completed if the IQ test is given first, and a child does not appear to have the IQ? Since that factor alone will prohibit a child from qualifying, must the psychologist give achievement tests that have been requested?

**Answer:** Yes – all three components of the assessment must be included – this requirement is included in the Intellectually Gifted Eligibility Standards. The Eligibility Standards also require grade level screening once in grades K-4, Individual Screening as the result of grade level screening, and Comprehensive Assessment. The Educational Performance and Creativity/Characteristics of Gifted Components should be assessed before evaluation of the student's cognitive abilities (Cognition Component). After assessment in these components is completed, the Assessment Team determines the most appropriate test of cognition for the student. This is one of the major reasons for requiring the use of the Tennessee Assessment Instrument Selection Form (TnATISF) prior to comprehensive assessment of all students. Tennessee's gifted assessment is multi-modal and multi-dimensional. Giftedness is evidenced in many ways. The TnATISF is a tool that, if used appropriately, will ensure the choices made for Comprehensive Assessment of Intellectual Giftedness are culturally-fair and appropriate for each individual student.

**50) Question:** Can the TONI 3 be used as the IQ measure for an economically disadvantaged student referred for the gifted program?

**Answer:** The TONI-3 meets the criteria established for cognitive assessment of gifted (individually-administered, standardized) and can be used for assessment of students who need a non-verbal assessment under a number of situations. You can find this information on the web at:

<http://ags.pearsonassessments.com/group.asp?nGroupInfold=a19100> .

**51) Question:** What do you consider to be 'other more appropriate assessments' when the Assessment Team completes the TnATISF? You discussed the use of a variety of IQ tests based on knowledge of each child. It was stressed to us that it is very important to use particular tests--IQ and Achievement--that fit the profile of the child. Due to the size of our system and the case load of the psychologists, most of them use the WISC IV or the RIAS. Our large population is 90% minority. Would you provide us with a list of instruments and the populations for which they are recommended?

**Answer:** These are just a few examples of assessment approaches that may be more appropriate for some students in the Educational Performance and Cognition Components:

#### Education Performance

1) an individual, standardized test of achievement when:

- the student has Attention Deficit Disorder,
- the student's environment does not provide him/her with the motivation or peer-acceptance of high achievement,
- the student's test-taking skills are poor and result in group assessment scores that are significantly lower than his/her current level of academic ability.

2) the Tennessee Supplementary Performance Checklist (TnSup) when there is compelling evidence checked from the TnATISF for consideration of Assessment Option 3.

Cognition:

School Psychologists should be knowledgeable of the continuum of different cognitive/intelligence assessments and the normative populations for which these instruments are more valid. Some assessments that are frequently used when cultural fairness and/or language differences are significant considerations include: Cognitive Assessment System-Naglieri (CAS), C-TONI, TONI-III, UNIT, K-ABC, and the RIAS. These assessments are more culturally fair for students who have not had the opportunity to build those verbal skills typically assessed by verbally-loaded tests such as the WISC-IV or SB-V. The SB-V is especially effective in measuring the cognitive ability of students with high verbal abilities and would be a good choice for students with visual-perceptual or physical deficits. The NNAT (Naglieri Nonverbal Assessment Test) is a very good instrument for identifying ESL and culturally-diverse populations.

The RIAS is generally an effective instrument to use for a valid evaluation of giftedness in minority populations. I would suggest you build a library (for check-out as needed) of other cognitive assessment instruments that may be more appropriate in different situations. The Gifted Manual will have descriptions of instruments that would best measure students with different risk factors. As I stated above, the WISC-IV is very heavily loaded with verbal factors. The WISC-IV can also be valid in many cases – when a student's verbal abilities are significantly lower than his/her gifted ability. This is the situation when you would use the 'split-criteria' to determine the student's cognitive ability. The use of Split Discrepancy is described earlier in this section.

When the IEP Team is completing the TnATISF and determining which instruments to use, the concern is not whether the child is black, Hispanic, or white. The concern is if the student has had the 'opportunity to learn'. The concern is if the student has 'support systems' in place so he or she can excel and meet his or her potential. The concern is whether the student has a dual disability or a visual, auditory, or motor problem that would prevent a valid assessment of the student's educational performance or cognition by traditional assessment instruments. A minority student whose parents are teachers, lawyers, or doctors would not need a specific non-traditional assessment – unless there are specific concerns individual for that student (e.g., dual disability, non-English speaking, or visual/auditory/motor problems). On the other hand you may have a very bright Hispanic child who does not yet read or think fluidly in English but has been referred by the ESL teacher due to observed 'potential'--the child's quickness in learning. This student should be assessed with a nonverbal assessment like the C-TONI, the TONI-III, the UNIT, or the NNAT.

**52) Question:** We have a student who was identified as Gifted in Georgia and according to his records; his cognitive abilities were measured through administration of the CogAT-Naglieri. Are we allowed to use the CogAT as a measure of intelligence for identifying students as Gifted in TN? Also, is there a list of the IQ tests that are allowed to use for identifying students as Gifted in TN?

**Answer:** The CogAT cannot be used for Assessment Option 14. The disability standards for Intellectually Gifted require an individualized, standardized test of cognition/intelligence. The CogAT is a group administered ability test battery; however, it would be an excellent tool to use for Grade Level Screening.

**53) Question:** Does CogAT measure students' innate abilities? Is the CogAT an IQ test and are SAS scores IQ scores?

**Answer:** No. All abilities are developed through experience. CogAT measures students' abilities to reason with words, quantitative concepts, and nonverbal (spatial) pictures. These abilities are developed through experiences in school and outside of school. CogAT measures reasoning abilities. Although these abilities are central to all definitions of intelligence, the word intelligence implies much more. However, psychologists have never agreed on the definition of intelligence, so how much more should be included in an intelligence test is often debated. The notion of IQ or intelligence quotient comes from an earlier set of procedures for indexing the rate of mental development. The CogAT does not use these procedures. The SAS scale used on CogAT provides normalized Standard Age Scores for that fraction of the population that attends school. Although SAS scores are very helpful for professionals, nonprofessionals can confuse them with IQ scores. Therefore, they are generally not reported to parents and lay organizations. Percentile ranks and stanine scores are better suited for general audiences.